



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

Paper No. 7

HAVERSTOCK & OWENS  
162 NORTH WOLFE ROAD  
SUNNYVALE, CA 94086

COPY MAILED

JUL 18 2003

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of :  
Louis Bouchard :  
Application No. 09/842,747 : DECISION GRANTING PETITION  
Filed: April 25, 2001 : UNDER 37 CFR 1.137(b)  
Attorney Docket No. AVALUC-01800 :

This is a decision on the petition, filed June 6, 2003, which is being treated as a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) to revive the instant nonprovisional application for failure to timely notify the U.S. Patent and Trademark (USPTO) of the filing of an application in a foreign country, or under a multinational treaty that requires publication of applications eighteen months after filing. See 37 CFR 1.137(f).

The petition is GRANTED.

Petitioner states that the instant nonprovisional application is the subject of an application filed in an eighteen month publication country on April 4, 2002. However, the USPTO was unintentionally not notified of this filing within 45 days subsequent to the filing of the subject application in an eighteen month publication country.

In view of the above, this application became abandoned pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 122(b)(2)(B)(iii) and 37 CFR 1.213(c) for failure to timely notify the Office of the filing of an application in a foreign country or under a multilateral international agreement that requires publication of applications 18 months after filing.

A petition to revive an application abandoned pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b)(2)(B)(iii) for failure to notify the USPTO of a foreign filing must be accompanied by:

- (1) the required reply which is met by the notification of such filing in a foreign country or under a multinational treaty;

- (2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m);
- and
- (3) a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date of the reply until the filing of a grantable petition was unintentional.

The instant petition has been found in compliance with 37 CFR 1.137(b). However, while the statement of unintentional delay does not comply with the rule, the statement presented will be construed as meaning that "the entire delay in filing the required reply [notification of foreign filing under 35 U.S.C. § 122(b)(2)(B)(iii)] until the filing of a grantable petition was unintentional." Accordingly, the failure to timely notify the Office of a foreign or international filing within 45 days as provided by 35 U.S.C. § 122(b)(2)(B)(iii) is accepted as having been unintentionally delayed.

The previous Request and Certification under 35 U.S.C. § 122(b)(2)(B)(i) has been previously rescinded.

Any inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to Wan Laymon at (703) 306-5685.

This application is being forwarded to Technology Center Art Unit 2153 for examination in due course.



Frances Hicks  
Lead Petitions Examiner  
Office of Petitions  
Office of the Deputy Commissioner  
for Patent Examination Policy